

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 6-9, 13-17, 19, and 20 have been amended. The specification has been amended to refer to block 750 as suggested by the Examiner. Proposed drawing corrections to Figures 1, 2 and 7 are included with this Amendment.

Objection to the Drawings

Figure 1 was objected to as failing to include the designation of a legend such as "Prior Art." Figures 1 and 2 were objected to as missing element number "100." A proposed drawing correction adding this legend and element number "100" has been submitted on an even date with this Amendment. As suggested by the Examiner, Figure 7 has been amended to include block 750. The specification has been amended to refer to this block. No new matter has been added to the application. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Specification

The specification was objected to because of certain informalities, and has been amended above as requested by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 6, 7, 13, 14, and 17-20 were objected to because of certain informalities. Claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 17, 19, and 20 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 8, 9, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing to distinctly claim the present invention. Claims 8, 9, 15 and 16 have been amended to refer to devices and access points operating according to the Bluetooth specification, making the claims more definitive. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8, 9, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 8, 10 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gushiken, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0041587 (“Gushiken”) in view of Okuyama et al., U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0126408 (“Okuyama”). Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gushiken in view of Okuyama in view of what the Office Action describes as “Applicant’s admitted prior art” (“AAPA”). In discussing the Gushiken and Okuyama references, Applicants are making no admission that either of these references has a filing date before the invention date of the present application.

The present invention concerns an electronics system, such as a mobile computer including a mechanism for optimizing system performance in mobile applications. In claim 1, a mobile system is provided with a storage device, a vibration sensor to generate a signal indicating the presence of mechanical vibrations, and a chipset with a storage controller that receives the signal. Doing so prevents damage to the storage device (e.g., a hard disk drive).

Gushiken refers to a handheld computing device, such as a notebook computer or mobile telephone that seeks to save power in its transmissions. Though it is true that the

reference refers to damage that can be caused to a hard disk drive when operating such a drive during vibration, Gushiken provides no further teaching as to how to store information on the HDD. In the detailed specification of Gushiken, only paragraph 86 discusses the HDD, and states as follows:

Further, it is possible to store all of the data that are received while carrying the computer without driving the HDD in the computer in order to prevent damage to the HDD due to vibrations. When the computer is placed in a stable condition, it can request transfer of the stored data in the buffer memory to the data processing unit.

In Gushiken, when commercial AC power is not being supplied to the laptop, communication with the HDD is prevented. Thus, Gushiken does not teach or suggest at all the detection of vibration and the taking of action relative to the storage device. The transfer that is discussed above is simply between the buffer memory and the data processing unit. The Office Action states that Gushiken “does not specifically state a detection means to detect when the mobile computing system of figure 1 is in a stable or unstable condition.” Indeed, Gushiken does not teach detecting such a condition, beyond sensing whether AC power is being supplied to the mobile computing system.

Okuyama does not make up for the deficiencies of Gushiken. Referring to Fig. 4, Okuyama shows element 13, which can be a laptop computer coupled to a magnetic disk drive apparatus 17 (including an information recording/reproducing apparatus 23). An external sensor is provided for the hard drive that detects an external shock so that the data writing operation can be stopped.

Given the teachings of Gushiken and Okuyama, there is no suggestion to combine the references to achieve the presently claimed invention. As set forth above, Gushiken does not suggest that there should be any sensor for detecting vibration or an stable or unstable

condition. It only states that it is detecting when commercial AC power is or is not being supplied to the laptop computer.

Furthermore, features of the claims are wholly missing from the pending claims. For example, claim 1 recites a vibration sensor to detection the “presence of sustained or sporadic mechanical vibrations over a designated time duration;” recites the generating a “vibration signal;” recites “a chipset having a storage controller arranged to control accesses to [the] storage device including limiting accesses to [the] storage device ... in response to the vibration signal.” None of these features are found in the Gushiken or Okayama references taken individually or in combination. Likewise, claim 10 includes similar limitations. Claims 2-6, 8-9, 11-13 and 15-17 depend from and further define claims 1 and 10 and should be allowable for the same reasons.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

For all the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4255 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON

Dated: 8/11/04

By: 
Shawn W. O'Dowd
Reg. No. 34,687

KENYON & KENYON
1500 K Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 220-4200 telephone
(202) 220-4201 facsimile
DC1-501407